



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,470	12/27/2001	Derek Tam	1875.1350000	7771

28393 7590 12/02/2003

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
1100 NEW YORK AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

MALSAWMA, LALRINFAMKIM HMAR

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2825

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

10/026,470

Applicant(s)

TAM ET AL.

Examiner

Lex Malsawma

Art Unit

2825

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 05 November 2003. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached remarks.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-19.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Remarks

1. Applicants' remarks/arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons. Applicants submit that Ohwa teaches an N^+ doped gate electrode paired with P^+ doped source/drain terminals and that Tarabbia teaches a P^+ doped gate electrode paired with N^+ doped source/drain terminals: therefore, Ohwa and Tarabbia clearly teach away from Applicants' claimed invention. Applicants assert that Tarabbia's "cumulative" capacitor and advantages of such do not suggest the use of a P^+ doped gate electrode in the single capacitor of the present invention. It is important to note that the currently claimed invention does not specifically require a single capacitor, e.g., independent claims 1 and 16 are drawn to a semiconductor device which functions as a capacitor, and independent claims 6 and 11 only specify "a capacitor", i.e., "a capacitor" as recited in the currently claimed invention would include a "cumulative capacitor" (as disclosed by Tarabbia), since the "cumulative capacitor" essentially functions as a "single" capacitor. Furthermore, the currently claimed invention does not require a "single" capacitor comprising a P^+ doped gate electrode that is specifically paired with P^+ doped source/drain terminals; therefore, Applicants' assertion that Ohwa and Tarabbia clearly teach away from the claimed invention is not persuasive. In summary, modifying Ohwa by utilizing a P-type capacitor (as taught by Tarabbia) would result in at least a [cumulative] capacitor comprising all pertinent features of the claimed capacitor; therefore, all pending claims stand rejected under 35 USC § 103.

Art Unit: 2825

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lex Malsawma whose telephone number is 703-306-5986. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday (1 PM - 9:30 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Smith can be reached on 703-308-1323. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Lex Malsawma



November 25, 2003



MATTHEW SMITH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800